

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16 and 18 are currently pending in this application. Claims 5, 11 and 17 are canceled without prejudice. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16 and 18 are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-6, 8-10, and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0259536 to Keskar et al. (hereinafter Keskar) and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046401 to Abbott et al. (hereinafter Abbott). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keskar and further in view of Abbott as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Well Known Prior Art – Official Notice.

Regarding claims 1, 6, 12-13 and 18, Keskar teaches a user input device configured to monitor user interaction while Abbott teaches a wearable computer that uses predictive cognitive logic. Both Keskar and Abbott teach a method and electronic device where a cognitive logic device is merely configured for a single user.

For example, Keskar frequently refers to “the user’s preferences” or “the user,” both indicative of a single user. Similarly, Abbott refers to the “current

context of the user” or the “current UI needs.” These phrases are indicative of a single user in different contexts or situations, and in no way imply distinguishing between style patterns of multiple users.

Therefore, Keskar, either alone or in combination with Abbott, fails to teach a method and electronic device where a cognitive logic device is configured for multiple users. Neither reference discloses or suggests a method or electronic device where a single cognitive logic device is configured to distinguish between style patterns of multiple users. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 6, 12-13 and 18 are allowable over the cited references of record.

Claims 2-4 are directly or indirectly dependent upon claim 1, which the Applicants believe are allowable over the cited references of record for the same reasons provided above. Claims 7-10 are dependent upon claim 6, which the Applicants believe are allowable over the cited references of record for the same reasons provided above. Claims 14-16 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 13, which the Applicants believe are allowable over the cited references of record for the same reasons provided above.

Based on the arguments presented above, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-10 and 12-18 is respectfully requested.

**Applicant: Ozluturk et al.
Application No.: 10/726,372**

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephonic interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Fatih Ozluturk et al.

By /Neil C. Maskeri/
Neil C. Maskeri
Registration No. 61,591

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

NCM/WTM/ls
Enclosure